



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/815,588

04/01/2004

Patrick W. McManus

14858-0006

1161

27268 7590 03/11/2009

BAKER & DANIELS LLP
300 NORTH MERIDIAN STREET
SUITE 2700
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204

EXAMINER

GORDON, STEPHEN T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3612

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/11/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte: PATRICK W. MCMANUS
and MARTIN P. MCMANUS

Application No. 10/815,588
Technology Center 3600

Mailed: March 11, 2009

Before KRISTA ZELE *Deputy Chief Appeals Administrator*
ZELE, *Deputy Chief Appeals Administrator*.

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on November 18, 2008. A review of the application revealed that it is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being returned to the Examiner to address the following matter(s) requiring attention prior to docketing.

APPEAL BRIEF, GROUNDS OF REJECTION

A review of the file finds that the grounds of rejection of the claims as provided in the Appeal Brief filed July 16, 2007 under the heading “Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal” is unclear and/or is not consistent with the grounds of rejection of claims of record. The grounds of rejection of the claims as provided in the Appeal Brief must be consistent with the last Office action of record, including any Advisory action responsive to any after final submissions. Each Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal must be identified.

A review of the last Office action, including any mailed Advisory Action(s) finds that claims 3, 7, 8, 12-13, 20, 25 and 42-43 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatenable over Corey; claims 3 and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatenable over St. Marie; claims 2 and 8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatenable over Hodges; 3 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatenable over Fillios; 7 and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatenable over Bradford; claim 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatenable over Anderson; claims 25, 36 and 44-46 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

Application No. 10/815,588

being unpatenable over Fillios; claims 44-46 rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§ 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being unpatenable over Anderson; and claim 49 rejected

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatenable over Anderson are not

identified under the Grounds of Rejection to be reviewed in the

Appeal Brief. Correction of the Grounds of rejection to be reviewed

on appeal for all claims is required.

EXAMINER'S ANSWER, EVIDENCE RELIED UPON

In the Examiner's Answer mailed November 19, 2007 (See Amended Answer filed December 26, 2007) under "Evidence Relied Upon" the reference: Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary 1990 (referred to herein as "Dictionary") is listed but there does not appear to be a copy of the reference scanned into the file.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the application is returned to the Examiner to:

- 1) hold the Appeal Brief filed July 16, 2007 defective;
- 2) notify Appellant to file a paper properly addressing the Grounds of rejection of all claims;

Application No. 10/815,588

3) acknowledge and consider any “paper” submitted by Appellant to correct the Appeal Brief;

4) provide a scanned copy in the file of the Dictionary reference; and

4) for such further action as may be appropriate.

If there are any questions pertaining to this Order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

KZ/MV/SD

BAKER & DANIELS LLP
300 North Meridian Street
Suite 2700
Indianapolis, IN 46204